



IFW

PATENT  
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 053785-5130

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: )  
Jae-Yong PARK et al. ) Confirmation No. 1791  
Application No.: 10/608,219 ) Group Art Unit: 2818  
Filed: June 30, 2003 ) Examiner: M. Tran  
For: DUAL PANEL-TYPE ORGANIC ) **Mail Stop Amendment**  
ELECTROLUMINESCENT DISPLAY )  
DEVICE AND METHOD OF )  
FABRICATING THE SAME )

Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
**2011 South Clark Place, Mail Stop Amendment**  
Customer Window  
Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03  
Arlington, VA 22202

Sir:

**RESPONSE TO ELECTION/RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated September 24, 2004, Applicants provide the following response.

Applicants hereby elect Group I (claims 1-8) with traverse. Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on grounds that no undue burden would be placed upon the Examiner if both Group I and Group II inventions were simultaneously examined. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that a search for the device of the Group I invention would, based on the requirement that a complete and thorough search be performed by the Examiner, inherently include a search within the Class/Subclass containing art directed toward methods of fabricating the device of the

Group I invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that no undue burden would be placed upon the Examiner if the inventions of both Groups I and II were examined at the same time.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that the Restriction Requirement is incomplete since no "materially different process" has been identified or alleged by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Restriction Requirement fails to establish distinctness between the Inventions identified by the Requirement as Group I and Group II.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement and formal examination of the Group I and Group II inventions of this application.

**Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).**

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47, 362

Dated: October 22, 2004

**Customer Number 009629**

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: 202.739.3000  
Fax: 202.739.3001